

1 BILAL A. ESSAYLI  
United States Attorney  
2 DAVID T. RYAN  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 Chief, National Security Division  
COLIN S. SCOTT (Cal. Bar No. 318555)  
4 AMANDA B. ELBOGEN (Cal. Bar No. 332505)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
5 Terrorism and Export Crimes Section  
1500 United States Courthouse  
6 312 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
7 Telephone: (213) 894-3159/5748  
Facsimile: (213) 894-0141  
8 E-mail: colin.scott@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 24-CR-00761

13 Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING STIPULATION TO  
CONTINUE TRIAL DATE AND FINDINGS  
REGARDING EXCLUDABLE TIME PERIODS  
PURSUANT TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

14 v.

15 Zheng et al.,

16 Defendant.

**CURRENT TRIAL DATE:** October 14,  
2025

**[PROPOSED] TRIAL DATE:** December  
17, 2025

**[Proposed] Pretrial Motions**  
**Deadline:** November 3, 2025

21 The Court has read and considered the Stipulation Regarding  
22 Request for (1) Continuance of Trial Date and (2) Findings of  
23 Excludable Time Periods Pursuant to Speedy Trial Act, filed by the  
24 parties in this matter on June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025. The Court hereby finds that  
25 the Stipulation, which this Court incorporates by reference into this  
26 Order, demonstrates facts that support a continuance of the trial  
27  
28

1 date in this matter, and provides good cause for a finding of  
2 excludable time pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

3 The Court further finds that: (i) the ends of justice served by  
4 the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and  
5 defendant in a speedy trial; (ii) failure to grant the continuance  
6 would be likely to make a continuation of the proceeding impossible,  
7 or result in a miscarriage of justice; (iii) failure to grant the  
8 continuance would unreasonably deny defendant continuity of counsel  
9 and would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for  
10 effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due  
11 diligence; and (iv) the case is so unusual and so complex, due to the  
12 nature of the prosecution and the number of defendants, that it is  
13 unreasonable to expect preparation for pre-trial proceedings or for  
14 the trial itself within the time limits established by the Speedy  
15 Trial Act.

16 THEREFORE, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN:

17 1. The trial in this matter is continued from October 14, 2025  
18 to December 17, 2025.

19 2. The time period of October 14, 2025 to December 17, 2025,  
20 inclusive, is excluded in computing the time within which the trial  
21 must commence, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. . §§ 3161(h) (7) (A),  
22 (h) (7) (B) (i), (h) (7) (B) (ii) and (h) (7) (B) (iv) .

23 3. Defendant shall appear in Courtroom 9A of the Federal  
24 Courthouse, 350 W. 1st Street, Los Angeles, California on December  
25 16, 2025 at 8:30 a.m.

26 4. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a finding that other  
27 provisions of the Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time  
28 periods are excluded from the period within which trial must

1 commence. Moreover, the same provisions and/or other provisions of  
2 the Speedy Trial Act may in the future authorize the exclusion of  
3 additional time periods from the period within which trial must  
4 commence.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
DATE

**DENIED**

BY ORDER OF

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
07/17/25

HONORABLE PERCY ANDERSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Presented by:

/s/  
COLIN S. SCOTT  
Assistant United States Attorney